

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets makes changes to Figs. 2, 5-7, and 9-12 and replace the original sheets with Figs. 2, 5-7, and 9-12.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1-10 are amended. Claims 1-10 were rewritten for clarity. Support for the final paragraph of claim 1 can be found in Fig. 6 and original claim 1. Figs. 2, 5-7, and 9-12 have been amended, and will be discussed below. No new matter was added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Weaver in the July 16, 2008 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because it is too long. A substitute Abstract is enclosed. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Figs. 9-12 were objected to for lacking a proper legend. Figs. 9-12 have been labeled as "Related Art." Applicants respectfully submit that Figs. 9-12 are not prior art. As noted in the Brief Description of the Drawings, Fig. 9 is a cross section taken from Fig. 1. Fig. 1 is described as an embodiment of the invention. Also, Figs. 10-12 refer to Fig. 9. As Figs. 9-12 relate to an embodiment of the invention, they are not prior art. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

All the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for improper cross hatching. Figs. 2, 5-7, 9 and 12 have been amended to show the proper type of cross hatching for plastic. Corrected drawing sheets in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) are attached. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

The drawings were objected to for failing to show the features of claim 8. The objection is respectfully traversed. The roughened surfaces of claim 8 are characteristics of the surfaces, which are not appropriately depicted in a drawing. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand by looking at the figures where the contacting surfaces are and

one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what a rough surface is based only on a description. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

The specification was objected to because the brief description of Fig. 12 appears to be inaccurate. The description of Fig. 12 has been corrected in the Substitute Specification to refer to Fig. 9. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

The specification was objected to because of references to claims. References to claims have been eliminated in the Substitute Specification. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims were amended to include proper antecedent basis and to remove double inclusions. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii et al. (EP 0 650 900 A1) in view of Iizuka et al. (JP-A-2000-335584) or Saito et al. (JP-A-7-156952) or Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,931,324). The rejection of claims 1-10 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for a handle that is . . . insert-molded with the bottle. Claim 1 also calls for embedded ridges that have a surface disposed towards a central axis of a preform of the bottle. As agreed during the telephone interview, Ishii, Iizuka, Saito and Lyons, either alone, or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest these features.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Ishii and either of Iizuka, Saito or Lyons. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 9 and 10 were rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Itokawa et al., claims 1, 12 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,108,146 (Itokawa 1) in view of Iizuka et al. (JP 2000-335584). Claims 3 and 9 were rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Itokawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,185,777 (Itokawa 2) in view of Ishii. As explained by Examiner Weaver during the telephone interview, Applicants understand that the rejections also apply to the claims from which claims 3, 7, 9 and 10 depend. The rejection of claims 3, 7, 9 and 10 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for embedded ridges that have a surface disposed towards a central axis of a preform of the bottle. Applicants respectfully submit that Itokawa 1 and Itokawa 2 do not claim these features and that Iizuka and Ishii would not have made the features obvious to claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/eks

Attachments:

Abstract
Figs. 2, 5-7 and 9-12
Clean Copy of Specification
Marked-up Copy of Specification
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: July 28, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--